A Brief

DISCOURSE

Concerning the UNLAWFULNESS of the

Common-Prayer-WORSHIP;

AND OF

Laying the HAND on

AND

Kissing the BOOK

IN

SWEARING.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

By a Reverend and Learned Divine.

The Second Impression.

2 Kings 18. 4. *He removed the high places, and brake the Images, and cut down the Groves, and brake in pieces the brasen Serpent that* Moses *had made; for unto those dayes the Children of* Israel *did burn Incense to it; and he called it* Nehushtan.

Reprinted at *London* in the Year 1689.

Mather 8°. 131.

TO THE READER.

THE following Diſcourſe falling into my hands, my Affection to the labouring Truths therein argued for, and my concernedneſs for the Information of them, that I am every way bound to be a Well-wiſher to, quickly made me ſenſible, that to keep it in a private hand would be a more culpable Concealment of a Treaſure, than to bury Gold; eſpecially ſince the Golden-mouth'd Ancient hath long ſince convinced, that to conceal the Truth is to betray it. *That this Lamp of the Sanctuary then may give Light unto the whole Houſe, the Preſs hath been imployed to Communicate it; bleſſed be GOD for the*

To the Reader.

Advantage which the Church now Enjoys above former Ages, in ſo diffuſive an Inſtrument of all Knowledge and Goodneſs, as that of Printing is become. I ſhall forbear to declare unto the World the Name of that worthy Perſon unto whom we are beholden for this Elaborate Compoſure, only that it hath for its Author a Learned and Pious Miniſter: I ſhould be loth to occaſion him any trouble; and ſhall entreat the Reverend Author to pardon my not asking his Conſent in thus diſpoſing of his Manuſcript, and I am ſure he will not be offended with me, when he ſhall hear that many hundreds have been thereby Eſtabliſhed in the preſent Truth.

T. P.

SIR,

SIR,

MUltiplicity of Occaſions and Diverſions will not permit me to return an Elaborate Anſwer to every one that ſhall ſend Queſtions to me. But as for your ſelf, I have peculiar Cauſe to reſpect, and endeavour your Satisfaction. And inaſmuch as the Enquiries which you have Communicated to me, are both Weighty and Seaſonable, I have thought it *Operæ pretium*, to ſpend ſome hours in Searching into the Controverted Subjects, being alſo ready (as in Duty I am bound) to give a Reaſon of my Perſwaſion to ſuch as ſhall in Serioufneſs demand it of me.

Your firſt Queſtion is thus Propoſed,

VVhat are the Reaſons why you Judge it Unlawfull to be preſent at, or to partake in the Common-Prayer-VVorſhip.

Anſw. My Firſt Reaſon is, *From the Original of the Common-Prayer Book, which with the Ceremonies and Worſhip preſcribed therein, I find to be in a great meaſure Popiſh and Heatheniſh.* Some have cauſeleſly Complained of Non-conformiſts, becauſe they affirm that the *Engliſh* Liturgy is taken out of the Pope's *Maſs-book*. It's true, that as the *Maſs-book* is taken in a more ſtrict fence, a great part of the *Engliſh Liturgy* is not to be found therein: But as the *Miſſal* is put for the whole *Roman Liturgy*, (and ſo it many times is, a part being put for the whole) it cannot be denyed but that the Common-Prayer Book is from thence derived: There are things (as Prayers for the Dead, *&c.*) in the *Roman Liturgy* which are not Tranſlated into *Engliſh*, but very little is in the *Engliſh* which is not to be found in the other. This is particularly cleared up by the Learned Author of the Book called *Altare Damaſce-*

Damaſcenum, which goeth under the Name of *Didoclavius*, but Mr. *David Calderwood* was the true Author. Alſo there are many Treatiſes in *Engliſh* which may be Conſulted concerning this matter, particularly, a Book called *A Parallel between the Maſs-book and the Liturgy, and the Anatomy of the Service Book*, which goeth under the Name of *Dwalphintramis*: And Mr. *John Allin* of *Dedham* in *New-England*, his Defence of the Nine Poſitions, *p.* 63, 66. and a *Diſcourſe of Liturgies*, by *H. D.*

If you would have a diſtinct Account of the Original of the Common Prayer Book, you muſt know, it was Collected out of three Superſtitious Books: The firſt part of Publick Prayer is borrowed from the Papiſt's *Breviary*; that about Sacraments, Matrimony, Burials, *&c.* is taken out of the *Ritual*; the Order of Conſecration, Epiſtles, Collects, *&c.* is gathered out of the *Roman Miſſal.*

Hence the *Engliſh Liturgy* has been well approved of by Papiſts. A Jeſuit being asked how he liked the Service at *Paul's*, gave this Anſwer, *I have nothing againſt it, but that it is done by your Prieſts.* When Secretary *Walſingham* had in Policy cauſ-

ed two Popiſh Intelligencers then in *England* to have a View of *London* and *Canterbury*-Service, they were Marvellouſly taken therewith, ſaying, "That the Pope "had been miſinformed, for their Service "was very like his own: And they thereupon Endeavoured that the Pope's Bull might be recalled. Pope *Pius* the Fifth was willing to ratifie the Common Prayer Book by his Authority, if Queen *Elizabeth* would have ſo retained it. Dr. *Carriar* (a Popiſh Bigot) ſpeaketh very favourably of the *Engliſh Liturgy*, becauſe he ſaith, "There is nothing in it Ex-"preſly contrary to theirs.

It is very Strange that any of our Lyturgical Men ſhould have the face to deny theſe things; but ſome of them have Ingenuouſly acknowledged the Truth of what we aſſert. He that has Written Mr. *George Herbert*'s Life, declares that he diſlikes not the *Engliſh Liturgy* the more for being taken out of the *Maſs-book*, *It is* (ſaith he) *taken out as Gold from Droſs: The wiſe Reformers knew* Rome *would cry Schiſm, Schiſm, and therefore they kept all they lawfully could keep, being loth to give offence*; thus he. To this Objection, *That the Form of our Liturgy is taken from Antichriſt*,

tichriſt, Dr. *Covel*'s Anſwer is, *We are ſorry that their Weakneſs takes Offence at that which we hold as a Virtue in the Church of* England; *Namely, that we have ſo ſparingly, and as it were unwillingly diſſented from the Church of* Rome, *for ſurely by Antichriſt they mean her*, Exam. *p.* 185. Likewiſe Dr. *Boice* and Mr. *Wommock*, who have Written in defence of the Common Prayer-Book, Confeſs that 'tis a Daughter of the Roman Catholick; but they ſay, Why ſhould the Child be beaten for the Parents ſake; to whom it has been well replyed, Why ſhould not *Hagar* and *Iſhmael* be both put out of Doors together. A great Epiſcopalian owns that the *Roman Liturgy* is like a Leprous Houſe, only he ſuppoſeth that the Compilers of the Common Prayer Book have *picked, and ſcraped, and plaiſtered the Houſe*; but he ſhould have conſidered that the Rubbiſh of the Leprous Houſe ought to be caſt into an Unclean Place, and that the Leproſie breaks out ſtill, therefore we may have no Communion with it: But enough of theſe Allegories. I ſhall further confirm this Argument by two Royal Teſtimonies. The one is that of King *Edward* 6. who when the Popiſh Rebels in

in *Devonſhire* took up Arms againſt the King, becauſe of his eſtabliſhing the *Engliſh* Liturgy, he wrote thus to them: *It ſeemeth unto you a New Service, but it is indeed no other but the Old; the ſelf-ſame words in Engliſh, which were in Latin, ſaving a few things taken out, wich were ſo fond, that it had been a ſhame for to have them in Engliſh. If the Service of the Church was good in Latin, it remains good in Engliſh; for nothing is altered, but to ſpeak with Knowledge what was ſpoken with Ignorance, and to let you underſtand what is ſaid for you.* See Mr. *Fox* Acts and Monuments. *Vol.* 2. p. 669.

Another Teſtimony is that of King *James* of Famous Memory, who in his Speech to a National Aſſembly, *Anno* 1590 praiſeth GOD that he was *King in the Sincereſt Church in the World; ſincerer than the Church of* England, *for their Service is an* Ill ſaid Maſs, *ſincerer than* Geneva *it ſelf, for they obſerve* Paſche and Yule. *i. e. Eaſter and Chriſtmaſs, and what Warrant have they for that?*

But what need of words? Let ſuch as have any Hæſitancy about this matter, compare the *Popiſh Miſſal*, &c. with the *Engliſh Liturgy*, and they will be convinced:

ced: For my own part I have done it, and am ſatisfied; now it is a known Maxim, *Omnis honor Idoli eſt Idololatria.* He that ſhall put any reſpect upon an Idol, cannot be clear from the Sin of Idolatry. But the Maſs-Book is an Idol, and he that uſeth a Prayer, or joyns with a Prayer taken out of that Book, thereby puts Honour upon an Idol. We ought not to name an Idol but with Deteſtation, much leſs may we offer it as worſhip to God, *Pſal.* 16. 4. *Exod.* 23. 13. *Hoſea* 2. 16, 17.

How then can we joyn in Prayers taken out of the Idolatrous Maſs-Book, and offer them to the Holy GOD?

The Biſhop of *Exeter* is too Laviſh and Gaudy in his Rhetorick, when he tells us, That if *Saint Paul were alive, he would uſe the Engliſh Liturgy*; it was *Pauls* Judgment, that Meat once offered to Idols ſhould not be made uſe of, 1 *Cor.* 10. 28. *Ergo*, a Service-Book offered to Idols ought not to be uſed, for there is a Parity of Reaſon. We may here take Old *Cyprian*'s complaint, and ſay, *Ad hoc malorum devoluta eſt Eccleſia ut id faciunt Chriſtiani, quod Antichriſtiani faciunt.* It muſt be acknowledged that the Church of *England*

land men as keep to the Thirty nine Articles in matters of Doctrine, are as Orthodox as any Proteſtants in the World, but as to Worſhip and Diſcipline they are extreamly Popiſh: Which has occaſioned *Gretzer* (*de Feſt. Lib.* 8. *c.* 2.) to give them the ſtrange Name of *Calvino-Papiſtæ*: The uſe of ſuch a Liturgy doth harden the Papiſts in their Idolatry; yea, and the *Jews* themſelves are ſcandalized thereby: It's a celebrated ſaying among them, *That Chriſtians have their Tephilloth from Armillus.* h. e. Their Prayer-Books from Antichriſt. Moreover, that the *Engliſh* Liturgy is originally Heatheniſh as well as Popiſh, is manifeſt, in that the Popes Liturgy from whence ours has been derived, is ſo. The Principal parts of the Maſs-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous *Pagans*; they came from *Numa Pompilius*: the Veſtments, Holy water, Incenſe, *&c.* in the Roman Liturgy, were taken up from the Heathen; the Biſhops of *Rome* thinking thereby to gain *Pagans* to the Chriſtian Religion, juſt as the Biſhops of *England* thought to gain Papiſts to the Proteſtant Religion, by the uſe of their Ceremonies.

What vain Repetitions does the Common-Prayer Book abound with? In

In one Service the Worſhippers muſt repeat theſe words, *Good Lord deliver us*, eight times over, and *We beſeech thee to hear us*, twenty times over. The *Gloria Patri* is to be repeated ten times in the ſame Morning or Evening Service.

That the Heathens were wont to worſhip their Idols juſt after the ſame manner, is clear from thoſe words, *Mat.* 7. *When ye pray uſe not vain Repetitions*, as the Heathens do, *for they think that they ſhall be heard for their much ſpeaking*. When the ſame words are repeated often over like *Battus* his *Montibus erant & erant in montibus illis*, it is vain Repetitions, ſuch Battology is in the old Hymns of the Heathen *Greeks*. And *Beza* notes that the Roman Liturgy does abound with them, wherein men are taught to cry *Jeſu, Jeſu, miſerere mei*, no leſs than ten times one after another.

Some of the moſt learned Patrons of Liturgies produce it as an Argument for them, that the Heathen made uſe of Forms in their Idolatrous Worſhip. So, *Joſ. Vicecomes, de Miſſa Lib.* 7. *cap.* 21. and from him *Caſaubon:* And when *Tertullian* does declare that the Primitive Chriſtians did pray *Sine Monitore*, judicious Authors do conceive,

conceive, that his meaning is, that they did not as the Heathen were wont to do, *Say their Prayers* by the help of Forms which others had deviſed for them, but we are ſure that God hath ſtrictly prohibited his People all Symbolizing with the Heathen. He did forbid the Children of *Iſrael* ſome Civil uſages, becauſe he would not have them imitate the Heathen. Hence they might not wear a garment of Linnen and Woollen, *Lev.* 19. 19. the *Egyptian* Prieſts did wear ſuch, and the Lords Servants muſt not follow their Example. *Aquinas*, *Lyranus*, *Teſtatus*, and ſome other Pontificians, as well as Proteſtant Writers take this to be the true Reaſon of that Prohibition.

Herodotus tells us, that the *Arabians* were wont to ſhave their hair, and to cut the corners of their Beards. They alſo, and the *Syrians* and *Egyptians* made baldneſs betwixt their eyes; therefore the Children of *Iſrael* might not do ſo, *Lev.* 19. 27. *Deut.* 14. 1. They might not ſow their ground with divers ſorts of ſeed, nor ſeeth a Kid in the Mothers milk, becauſe the Heathen did ſo: But eſpecially they might not imitate them in matters referring to the Worſhip of God.

God. Hence they were prohibited going up by ſteps to the Altar, or to make any Altars of hewn Stone, *Exod.* 20. 24, 26. The Heathen who fancied an *auguſt pompous worſhip*, had ſuch Altars as theſe prohibited ones, where they had Groves near their Altars: Therefore the Lords People might not plant a Grove near his Altar, *Deut.* 16. 21. They worſhipped with their face towards the Eaſt, therefore the *Jews* might not do ſo. *Ezek.* 8. 16.

Reaſon 2. *From the matter of the Common-Prayer Book.*

There are many things contained therein which cannot be juſtified under this Head. It is eaſie to produce and inſiſt upon many Particulars, which might be improved as ſo many Arguments, evincing that the *Engliſh* Liturgy is a Book unſuitable, and ſo unlawful to be made uſe of in the Worſhip of GOD.

For,

1. *Some things appointed therein are now in the Judgment of Sober and Judicious perſons extreamly ridiculous.*

How many odd and ſenceleſs Tranſla-

tions

tions of the holy Scripture have been found therein?

Rom 12. 2. is tranſlated thus, *Be changed in your Shape*, John 2. 10. Thus, *when men be drunk*. Luke 1. 36. Thus, *This is the ſixth Month which is called Barren*: And Gal. 4. 25. *That Agar in Arabia bordereth on Jeruſalem*; with many more the like Abſurdities.

But theſe things are ſo groſs, that the Biſhops in their Debate with Dr. *Tuckney*, Dr. *Manton*, &c. have yielded to have them altered; ſo that the next Edition of the Common-Prayer Book is like to be Reformed. Nevertheleſs, they will not conſent to have the corrupt Tranſlation of the *Pſalter* corrected: Still thoſe words in *Pſal.* 18. 9. are read, *Or ever their Pots be made hot with Thorns, ſo let Indignation vex them, as a thing that is raw.* What Nonſence is this!

And in the Liturgy, the writings of the Prophets, and the *Acts* of the Apoſtles; yea, and the Book of the *Revelation*, are called *Epiſtles*. Moreover, thoſe broken Reſponds, and *Shreds of Prayer*, as Mr. *Cartwright* calls them, which the Prieſts and People toſs between them like Tennis-Balls, ſeem extreamly ridiculous

lous to ſtanders by: Therefore ſuch things ought not to be in the ſolemn Worſhip of God, who will not hold them guiltleſs that take his Name in vain.

2. *The Common-Prayer Book is guilty of violating the Sacred Word of God.* Sometimes the words of Scripture are thereby obliterated, and others put in their room: *e. g.* In the Catechiſm the Authors have changed thoſe words in the fourth Commandment, *The Lord bleſſed the Sabbath day*, into *the Lord bleſſed the Seventh day.* Sometimes the Liturgy makes bold directly and in terms to contradict the Scripture: For whereas in *Pſal.* 105. 28. it is ſaid, *They were not rebellious againſt his Word*, the Common-Prayer Book ſaith, *They were not obedient to his word*, which is directly contradictory to the Truth. Dr. *Spark*, (notwithſtanding his affection for the Liturgy) told the then *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, that ſo to read the words, is to charge *Moſes* and *Aaron* with falſhood. The Liturgy ſaith, That the Rod of the Wicked ſhall not *come* into the lot of the Righteous, whenas *David* only ſaith, that it ſhall not *reſt* there: and ſometimes the Common-Prayer Book adds to the Scripture; there are three

whole Verſes added to the fourteenth Pſalm; And the *Gloria Patri* is frequently added to Scriptures, as if it were Canonical: Sometimes words are ſacrilegiouſly ſtollen out of the Bible. *e. g.* In the Seventy ſecond Pſalm, the laſt verſe is omitted: ſo is the Scriptural Titles of many Pſalms; and I know not how often thoſe words, *Praiſe ye the Lord*, are left out. Amongſt men Clipping and corrupting of Coyn is Treaſon: And certainly it is a dreadful thing to addd to, or take from the Word of God. *Deut.* 4. 2. *Rev.* 22. 19.

3. In the Liturgy *The Apochrypha books are made equal with, nay, advanced above the Holy Scripture.* In the Preface to the Common-Prayer Book, it is ſaid, *That nothing is ordained to be read but the pure Word of God, or that which is evidently grounded on the ſame.* But is the Apochrypha ſo? Indeed the Liturgy appoints them to be read as Leſſons, juſt as I find it in the Popes Service-book, and in a greater proportion than Scripture; for (as ſome have obſerved) of an hundred Seventy two Apochryphal Chapters, but Thirty eight are omitted: So that theſe Books are equallized with the pure Word of God.

In

In the *Conference* at *Hampton* Court, the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* ſpoke out plainly, and ſaid thoſe Books muſt needs be held *canonici ad informandos mores.* Nay, the Liturgy advanceth them above the Scripture, by intimating that they are *more Edifying*, and can be leſs ſpared than many Portions of the Holy Canon; and by ordering them to be read on the higheſt Holy-days, and many of them twice, ſome thrice in one Year: And that which adds to this Iniquity, is, That the Lies, and Magical Preſcriptions, and moſt corrupt Doctrine expreſſed in the Book of *Tobit*, have been appointed to be read, as if theſe things were Divine.

4. *Such things are enjoyned in the Common-Prayer Book, as (to my Conſcience) cannot be practiſed without Sin.*

To Inſtance, Miniſters are required to give the Holy Communion to all new Married Perſons; whenas Marriage Feſtivals uſe to be accompanyed with ſuch Divertiſements and Merriments, as make Perſons altogether unfit for a Preſent actual Participation at the Holy Table.

Why then does the Common-Prayer Book appoint the Miniſter to give them the Sacrament on that very day?

By that Doctrine, all that may marry may come to the Lords Supper, whenas Marriage is an Ordinance, which Men as Men (and not as Christians only) have a right unto: So that by this Prescription many will be put upon making themselves guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and eat and drink damnation to their own Souls. And this does the Common-Prayer Book compell them unto; notwitstanding in the *Articles of the Church of England*, it is expresly and orthodoxly declared, that *unworthy Receivers purchase to themselves damnation.* Artic. 23. & 29.

Again, when any man is buried, the Priest must say at his Grave, *Almighty God has taken to himself the Soul of this dear Brother*; perhaps the most wicked wretch on the Earth, and that *his Body is committed to the ground, in sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to everlasting Life:* Though he did never truly, nor so much as visibly to the judgment of Rational Charity, repent of his Sins.

What Minister can do this with a good Conscience?

And there are many Superstitions both recommended and imposed in the Liturgy.

The

The putting on of the Ring in Marriage, eſpecially the making of that Ceremony to be an Eſſential matter, is Superſtition: And I do not ſee how Common-Prayer-Worſhippers can clear themſelves from all Superſtition, when they uſe thoſe words in the *Canticle Benedicite*; ſaying, *O Ananias*; *O Azarias, and Miſael, bleſs the Lord.* And when the Prieſt is appointed to *Church* Women, and that they muſt at that time *offer their Accuſtomed Offerings*, it is Jewiſh Superſtition. And the Obſervation of *Popiſh* Holy-days, eſpecially ſuch as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as highly ſuperſtitious: The like I believe concerning wearing of a *Surplice*, as a ſignification of Purity; when holy Veſtments were in uſe amongſt the *Jews*, they had an Expreſs Commandment from God about them. Should they have made a *Mitre* or an *Ephod*, or any other Eccleſiaſtical Garments of their own heads, they would have ſinned greatly; witneſs *Judg.* 8. 27. If the Church of old had no power to appoint ſacred Veſtments, no more has the Church in theſe days. It is incumbent on them who affirm they have ſuch power, to produce their Charter, which they can ever do. Moreover,

the *Surplice* is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Maſs-Mongers. In the *Roman Liturgy* it is ordained that the Prieſt ſhall ſay Service in his *Surplice*, and has no power to ſanctifie Bells, or Water, or any thing elſe, except his *Surplice* be on; which made *Latimer* when the *Surplice* was pluckt from him in his Degradation, in an holy ſcorn to ſay, *Now I can make no more Holy Water.* Neither can any Prieſt make his *Breaden God* except he have it on; ſee *Rhem. Annot.* on 1 *Cor.* 11. 29.

Shall Proteſtants do thus?

Dr. *Abbot* (who was no Fanatick) in his Book of Antichriſt, *Ch.* 11. *Sect.* 26. ſaith, *That all Prieſtly Garments, whereby Miniſters are diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Church, are a ſpecial part of the Character of the Beaſt.*

And who did the Papiſts take the *Surplice* from?

Partly from the *Jews* indeed, but alſo from the Heathen of old: There were *Veſtments for the Worſhippers of* Baal, 2 *Kin.* 10. 22. Biſhop *Jewel* (that great Light in the *Engliſh* Church) in the Defence of his Apology, *p.* 346. quotes and approves theſe Words out of *Nicholaus Leonicenus*,

The

The Prieſts of Iſis *uſed to wear Linnen Surplices, which ſeems to be derived from them to our time.*

For they that amongſt us ſerve the Holy Altars, may not ſuffer the hair of their heads, or their beards to grow, and in their Divine Service they uſe Linnen Garments: Thus he.

Moreover, the greateſt of our Proteſtant Divines have diſliked this Superſtitious Garment.

So *Martyr*, *Brentius*, *Bullinger*, *Gualter*, *Beza*, *Zanchy*, *Hemmingius*, *Polanus*; and many others.

To ſay no more of this, Mr. *Nichols* his Argument, which he propoſed to the Biſhop of *Cheſter*, is not eaſie to be anſwered; it was this, All Veſtments appropriated to the Worſhip of God, and appointed for the ſignification of Spiritual Duties by the Will of Man, are unlawful, but the Surplice is ſo, *Ergo*.

And the *Sign of the Croſs* in Baptiſm is as bad as this: That I confeſs was an old Superſtion, it crept early into the Church; but the firſt Uſers of it (ſo far as I am able to learn) were bad Men, and groſs Hereticks, *viz. Valentin* and *Montanus*. Mr. *Robert Parker* in his Elaborate Diſcourſe about the Croſs, proveth, that

it is a Sin againſt all the Ten Commandments, and a breach of the very Letter of the Second Commandment. For Men to appoint a Religious Ceremony, is a direct violation of the Second Commandment, which forbids all humane Inventions in Divine Worſhip, as any part thereof: And the Arguments which are brought againſt the Uſe of *Oyl*, *Cream*, *Salt*, *Spittle* in Baptiſm, (practiſed by the Papiſts) hold as well againſt the Croſs. The Prieſt may as well take a Thorn, and prick the Child's Forehead with it, to put in mind that Chriſt was crowned with Thorns, and that Chriſtians muſt ſuffer, as to Croſs him with any ſuch ſignification.

Hereby too great a reſpect is put upon that which was the Curſed Inſtrument of Chriſt's Death. Suppoſe a Man ſhould honour one of the Nails which faſtned Chriſt to the Croſs, (as ſome Fable that *Conſtantine* did) or the Spear that pierced Him, or the Whip wherewith *Pilate* cauſed Him to be Scourged, would it not be horrid Superſtition? Judicious and Holy Men have argued thus, if a Child ſhould Worſhip the Gallows on which his Father was hanged, that would manifeſt him to be ungracious and unnatural; and the Papiſts

piſts in adoring the Croſs do as bad. It's true, that the Scripture ſpeaks honourably of the Croſs of Chriſt, whereby we are crucified to the World, *Gal.* 6. 14. But that is not to be underſtood of the Croſs of Wood, nor yet of an Airy or Watery Croſs, but of the Death of that Jeſus who ſuffered on the Croſs. In a word, Mr. *Parker* ſheweth, *That the Croß is the greateſt Devil amongſt all the Idols of* Rome. This Superſtition hath been teſtified againſt by *Zegedinus*, *Zepperus*, *Goulartius*, *Bucanus*, Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *Rainolds*, and innumerable other Learned Proteſtant Writers: Nay, ſome Prælatical Men, who could comply with all the other Ceremonies, have ſcrupled this of the Croſs in Baptiſm. Dr. *Tailor* Confeſſeth, that they have in reſpect of the Croſs retained an uninſtituted Ceremony as a part of External Worſhip.

I ſhall here take Notice of but one Superſtition more, enjoyned by the Common-Prayer-Book, *viz.* That of *Kneeling at the Sacrament*. Men pretend that they Kneel out of Reverence to Chriſt, but Chriſt himſelf was perſonally preſent, when his Diſciples did partake of the Lord's Supper, yet they did not kneel,

but

but uſed the Table geſture then cuſtomary amongſt the *Jews*. Good and wiſe Men have choſen great Sufferings rather than to comply with this Invention.

Mr. *Cotton* (ſee his Anſwer to *Bailie*, p. 19.) was proffered not only the Liberty of his Miniſtry, but great Preferments, on Condition he would but *for one time Kneel in the Act of receiving the ſacramental Bread and Wine*: But he Objected this Argument, *Non-inſtituted Worſhip is unacceptable to God: Kneeling in the Act of receiving is Non-inſtituted Worſhip*, Ergo, *It is unacceptable to God.* So did that Holy and Learned Man chooſe rather to loſe his Preferments and his Livelyhood too, than to be guilty of ſuch a Superſtition.

Mr. *Dyton* and Mr. *Ware*, (worthy Men both of them) dyed in Priſon, becauſe they durſt not Kneel at the Sacrament.

It is certain, that in the Primitive Times Chriſtians did not Kneel in the Participation of the Euchariſt. In the *Nicene Council*, An. 325. there was a *Decree againſt Kneeling in the Church on the Lord's-day*: So that either there was no Sacrament adminiſtred on the Lords-Day, (which

(which to ſuppoſe is irrational) or there was no kneeling at it.

This is alſo to be ſeen in the *ſixth Council* held at *Conſtantinople*.

Kneeling was firſt enjoyned (ſo far as I can underſtand) in the year 1226. by Pope *Honorius*, being fitted to the Idolatry of Tranſubſtantiation. Some Popiſh Writers confeſs, that if the ſubſtance of the Bread remain after the Conſecration; they by kneeling before the Bread ſhould be guilty of as vile Idolatry, as ever the *Egpptians* were guilty of when they worſhiped every kind of Creature.

Coſterus (the Jeſuit) profeſſeth that he would be torn in pieces by wild Horſes, rather then he would kneel at the Sacrament, did he not believe the bodily Preſence.

So that Kneelers do dangerouſly ſymbolize with the Papiſts in their worſhipping of their breaden god.

That Religious worſhip which is before a Creature, and with reſpect to it, having no allowance from God, is againſt the Commandment: but ſo is Kneeling before the Bread and Wine.

Theſe things then prove that the Engliſh Liturgy is very corrupt. Now *to*

offer

offer to the Lord a corrupt thing, or that which is Lame and Sick, is evil, Mal. 1. 13, 14.

It is in vain for men to pleaſe themſelves, that though they joyn in Common-Prayer-Worſhip, they do not approve thereof.

Mr. *Cotton* in his Book againſt ſet Forms of Prayer, does truly and judiciouſly obſerve, that *Paul* in practiſing a few Ceremonies out of the Book of the Law, did thereby declare his ſubjection to the whole order of Worſhip, preſcribed by the Authority of that Law; *Acts* 21. 24. 26. in doing of which, undoubtedly he had ſinned, if God had not warranted the continuance of that Worſhip for a Seaſon.

Thus he that ſhall joyn with a few Prayers in the Common-Prayer Book, does really profeſs his ſubjection to the whole order of Worſhip preſcribed in that Book.

Reaſon 3. *Becauſe publick Liturgies of humane compoſure, are an Innovation and Deviation from primitive purity.*

The Common-Prayer Worſhippers are wont to urge and argue from *the Antiquity of Liturgies*, but I turn that weapon

pon againſt them. Let not any quibble with the Notation of the word *Liturgy*, which is as much as to ſay, λειτὸν ἔργον, *Opus publicum*, or of the word *Litany*, which cometh from the Greek, λιτανεύω, *Precor*; under theſe notions and acceptaons of the words, who ever denyed that the Church of God has always had a Liturgy, *h. e.* a Service of his own Inſtitution? but ſet Forms of Prayer deviſed by Men are an Innovation. Had a Liturgy been needful for the Edification of the Church, undoubtedly the Lord Chriſt, or the Apoſtles by His direction, would have compoſed one, which none of them ever did.

And therefore thoſe Men who take upon them to compoſe and impoſe a Liturgy on the Churches, aſſume to themſelves more than Apoſtolical Power.

I am ſurpized with wonderment, that in the late *grand Debate*, *p.* 110. between twelve Biſhops and others, with ſome learned men amongſt the *Nonconformiſts*, theſe words are found as proceeding from our Prelates, *That there were ancient Liturgies in the Church, is evident.* St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Baſil, and others, and the Greek tell us of* St. *James his, elder than they.*

This

This very Paſſage alone, is enough to convince me, that the Biſhops have a deſperate cauſe. I marvel not that Pontificians, ſuch as *Xainteſius*, *Poſſevinus*, *Lindanus*, and others, profeſſed Papiſts, ſpeak after this rate; and yet the more ingenious amongſt them confeſs the Liturgies mentioned to be ſpurious.

Durandus in his *Rationale*, lib. 5. *cap.* 2. honeſtly confeſſeth the Truth: That in the Primitive Times there was no Liturgy uſed in the Church.

As for thoſe fathered on the Apoſtles, and the Ancient Writers (called Fathers) after their days, many Learned men, but eſpecially *Peter Martyr*, *Morney*, *Rivet*, *Cocus*, *Rainold*, *Voetius*, &c. have by irrefragable Arguments, evinced them to be Suppoſititious and Spurious things. In that ſaid to be *Chryſoſtoms*, the Church is directed to pray for Pope *Nicholas*, who lived not till five hundred years after *Chryſoſtom* was dead: As for St. *James*'s Liturgy, it is ſo unlike an Apoſtle, as that *Bellarmin* himſelf judgeth it to be either wholly Spurious, or that others have added to it what they pleaſed; it mentions the *Anchorets*, and has other words in it, not known in the Apoſtles days.

Of

Of the like Authority are the Liturgies Fathered on *Peter*, *Mark*, and *Matthew*, in which there are Prayers for *Popes*, *Patriarchs*, and *Archbiſhops*, Creatures not known in the World, till long after the Apoſtles were dead.

It is clear from the words of *Juſtin Martyr*, (in *Orat. Apol.*) who lived 160 years after Chriſt, that then there was no Book of Prayer uſed by Chriſtians; for he ſaith, That the Miniſter did *pour out his Prayers*, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει, *according as ſtrength and utterance was afforded to him from Heaven*: It is as clear that in *Tertullians* time, (who lived 200 years after Chriſt) there was no Church-Liturgy; for he (*Apol. Cap.* 2.) declares, that Chriſtians in thoſe days prayed *Sine Monitore quia de pectore*, without the help of a prompted Form, becauſe from their Hearts.

And that there was no Liturgy in ſome Churches, or of general uſe in the Church for above four hundred years, is manifeſt from the words of *Socrates*, (who lived *Anno* 430.) he ſaith, There were ſcarce two Chriſtians found, who uſed the ſame words in Prayer. *Hiſt.* l. 5. *cap.* 21. It is true, that about the year 350. (*plus minus*)

minus,) ſome Churches in *Africa* begun to uſe ſtinted Liturgies, which was occaſioned by the groſs Ignorance and Heterodoxy that many of the Clergy were then found guilty of: So that the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 395. ordered that Miniſters ſhould not uſe Prayers compoſed by themſelves, *without conſulting their more able Brethren.* Hence alſo came in *Homilies*, becauſe many Miniſters were as unable to preach, as they were unfit to pray. In the declining Ages of the Church, many Liturgical Books were compoſed, *Sed ab initio non fuit ſic*: There are the Prayer Books of *Iſidorus*, *Flaccus*, *Strabo*, *Maurus*, *Berno*, *Hildebertus*, and others; as whoſo pleaſeth to conſult *Caſſanders Liturgica*, will ſee, theſe things if ſearched into will be found the Truth. There are who plead, that in the Jewiſh Church of old, there were Forms Prayer uſed beſides thoſe which were of Divine Inſpiration.

Credat Judæus Apella.

I know that ſome Jewiſh Doctors tell us, That *Ezra* and the *Men of the great Synagogue*,

nagogue, appointed eighteen Benedictions, yea, and that *David* appointed an hundred Benedictions. *Vide Buxtorf. Synagog. Cap.* 5. *In fine Druſii Præterit. ad Acts* 3. & 10. *Schindler Pentaglot. in voce Manach.* And I have ſeen Liturgies written in the Hebrew Tongue, but it is eaſie to perceive that they are late Compoſures. They that think to find any ſuch compiled before the Church of the Jews was degenerated into its preſent woful eſtate, will find themſelves diſappointed, as Biſhop *Andrews* was, when he cauſed a Jewiſh Liturgy to be tranſlated out of the Hebrew into the Latin Tongue, hoping that he ſhould have found ſomething therein to countenance the Engliſh Liturgy. *Genebrard* has emitted a Jewiſh Common-Prayer Book, wherein are Prayers for the Dead, a Superſtitious Commemoration of Saints: of ſo little weight is the Argument taken from the *Jews* Liturgies.

Reaſon 4. *In this Age of Light, it would in me, (and in all others ſo Educated and Inſtructed as I have been) appear to be a great Apoſtacy, ſhould I in the leaſt countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-Worſhip.*

The Corruptions of the Engliſh Liturgy have been abundantly diſcovered and born witneſs againſt by many Learned and worthy Men, whom God has raiſed up and enabled to do that Service for his Name and Truth.

The Books of the Famous *Cartwright* were long ſince Publiſhed, and ſince that a Treatiſe called, *A Survey of the Common-Prayer*, and *the Exceptions of the London Miniſters*, which cauſed them to refuſe Subſcription to the Liturgy, and *the Apology of the Non-conformiſts in Lincolnſhire*, and *the Reaſons of thoſe in Cornwall, and Devon*, and *the Defence of thoſe Reaſons, in three parts*; beſides many other Tracts emitted very lately; by all which the Light is convincingly manifeſted before the World.

Yea, and there have been many, and thoſe too, not of wilfull Tempers, but very humble and conſcientious; nor of weak parts, but as Eminent for Learning and Judgment, as any in the World, who have choſen to ſuffer, rather than to ſin in complying with the Liturgy. Amongſt theſe, I might mention Dr. *John Rainold*, Dr. *Ames*, and Mr. *Robert Parker*, (a Man of vaſt Reading and Abilities,)

Mr.

Mr. *Dod*, (whom Mr. *Burroughs* has fitly ſtyled the *Moſes* of his Time,) Mr. *Bradſhaw* and Mr. *Nichols*, not to ſpeak of others.

Only I would not forget thoſe Eminent and Faithful Miniſters of Chriſt, who were driven into an *American Deſart*, the principal Cauſe of whoſe Exile and Sufferings, was, becauſe they durſt not touch with the Common-Prayer Book; and ſince their being in *New-England*, ſome of them have by their Writings teſtified againſt it. The nine *Poſitions* (though written by Mr. *Davenport*, had the Approbation of the reſt of the *Elders in New-England*, and therein Reaſons are given, why it is unlawfull to be preſent at the Common Prayer-Worſhip, or any part thereof.

Mr. *John Cotton* of *Boſton*, (a Man deſervedly Famous in both *Englands*) has done the like: And Mr. *John Allen* of *Dedham* in *New-England*, (Mr. *Shepherd* of *Cambridge* joyning with him) in his *defence of the nine Poſitions*, has expreſly declared the Unlawfulneſs of being preſent at the Common-Prayer-Worſhip.

As for me, your ſelf knoweth what my Education has been. My Father was on Holy and a Learned Man, and one that ſuffered much for his *Non-conformity*;

ſhould I once go to hear Common-Prayer, I ſeriouſly profeſs, I know not how I ſhould be able to look my Father in the Face in the other World; much leſs how I ſhould anſwer Chriſt at the great Day for my Apoſtacy from thoſe Principles of Truth which my Father has iuſtruct-ed me in, both by Word and Example; *Gal.* 2. 18. is of weight with me.

Theſe, Sir, are ſome of the Reaſons why I judge it would be ſin in me to own the Common-Prayer-Worſhip: I have omitted the mentioning of many particulars con-tained in the Liturgy, which *as to the Do-ctrine of them are falſe* and corrupt. e. g. It is there affirmed, that *Children Bapti-zed have all things neceſſary to Salvation, and are undoubtedly ſaved*: Yea, that *it is certain from Gods Word, that if a baptized Child dye before actual Sin, 'tis ſaved*: this ſavours of *Pelagianiſm*: And that there are only two *Sacraments neceſſary to Salvation*, which implies a double Error, *viz.* that the Sacraments are neceſſary to Salvation; and that there are more Sacraments of the New Teſtament than two: And the Book ſaith that *ſome ſins are deadly*, as if the Popiſh diſtinction of ſins into *Mor-tal* and *Venial* were a ſound diſtinction,

and

and that Chriſt has Redeemed *all Mankind.*

I might here alſo have added, that a *ſtinted Liturgy is oppoſite to the Spirit of Prayer.* The Scripture teacheth, That Chriſtians ſhould pray *with all Prayer and Supplications in the Spirit.* Epheſ. 6. 18. which they cannot do, if they tye themſelves up to a ſet Form never to be varied from: I let paſs that Argument, *from the Miſchief of a Preſcript Liturgy*; it is the Inſtrument of a fooliſh Shepherd: An Idol and a dumb Miniſtry is thereby continued in the Church.

It is well known, that in a place in *Kent*, a common Fidler read Service for 12 *d. per* week; and perhaps that was more than he deſerved: But let me ſeriouſly add this further, That a *preſcribed Book is an Image or Help to Prayer deviſed by Men, but not ordained by God*, and therefore forbidden in the ſecond Commandment.

Mr. *Cotton* ſpeaketh weightily, in ſaying, *It is unlawful to bring in ordinarily any other Book into the publick Worſhip of God, beſide the Book of God.* To bring in another Book, is like bringing in of another Altar into the Temple beſides the Lords

Altar. If it be a ſin to ſet up a Poſt by God's Poſt, and a Threſhold by his Threſhold, *Ezek.* 42. 8. then it is a ſin to ſet up a Book by Gods Book; and conſequently it is a ſin to joyn with, or to countenance them that do ſo.

But before I proceed to your next *Queſtion*, give me leave to ſpeak a few words in anſwer to that which ſome take to be a ſufficient juſtification of the Liturgy, or at leaſtwiſe of their partaking in that Worſhip, viz. *In that the firſt Collectors and Publiſhers of it were good men, and divers of them died Martyrs.* Anſwer. Are not good Men, eſpecially in times of Darkneſs fallible, and their Example not to be followed, wherein they have fallen ſhort of the Rule. In ſome Ages good Men may do that, which if their Succeſſors having greater light ſhould follow them in, they would not be good; witneſs the *Polygamy* of the Fathers, not to mention other Errors: But as to the matter before us, thus it hath been. The whole Liturgy was ſaid or ſung in Latin in the Reign of King *Henry* 8. untill the year 1545, and then the Litany and no other part of the Liturgy was permitted in Engliſh; and that was the ſurtheſt

pace

pace the Reformation ſtept in that Kings Reign. See *Fuller Church-Hiſtory*. Book 7. *p.* 386. In *Anno* 1548. came forth the firſt Edition of the Common-Prayer Book in King *Edward* the Sixth's time.

There is no rule of Charity that does require us to believe that all the Perſons employed thereabout were good Men: For one of them was *George Day* the *Biſhop of Chicheſter*, he was a diſſembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Proteſtant, but afterwards ſhew'd himſelf to be a Papiſt: Yet many ſet awork about that affair, were truly Pious Men, who acted faithfully, according to the Light they had received in thoſe dawnings of Reformation out of Popiſh Darkneſs in *England*. Biſhop *Ridley* had an hand in that firſt Engliſh Liturgy, being the *hotteſt Stickler for Conformity in thoſe days*, but GOD gave him to ſee his Error before his Martyrdom, as is clear from his Letter to Mr. *Hooper*, publiſhed by Mr. *Fox*. Vol. 3. *p.* 146, 147.

Archbiſhop *Cranmer* was another, and the moſt Eminent amongſt the Compilers of the Engliſh Liturgy: But it is related in the *Hiſtory of the Troubles at Franckford*, p. 42. *That* Cranmer *had drawn*

up a Book of Prayers far more perfect than that which now we have, and that it could not take place, becauſe he was Matched with, and overpowred by a Popiſh and a Wicked Clergy.

So that the Common Prayer Book came forth no better than now we ſee it. Nevertheleſs, Eminent Divines did then teſtifie againſt thoſe Remainders of Popery which it does abound with.

Mr. *Rogers* (the Protomartyr in Queen *Mary's* Reign) and Mr. *Hooper*, (who dyed a Martyr alſo) were much troubled at the Service-Book. Moreover, great and learned Men of other Nations found fault with it; ſo did *Calvin*, and *Bucer*, and at laſt *Peter Martyr:* And *Bullinger* declared that he ſhould be loth to make uſe of it in his Church. Likewiſe *John à Laſco* (that famous and noble Reformer) expreſſed great diſſatisfaction at the *Engliſh Liturgy*. That Mr. *Knox* and the Chief Reformers in *Scotland* were offended at it, every Body knoweth.

In Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, the Biſhops made the Common Prayer Book to be in ſeveral things worſe and more intolerable than it was in the Dayes of King *Edward:* For in his time it was left free what

what to be read, nor were ſome Superſtitious Ceremonies then Impoſed upon the Conſciences of ſuch as could not comply with them.

No leſs than Twenty ſix Leſſons of Canonical Scripture, appointed to be read in King *Edward*'s Kalender, are Sacrilegiouſly blotted out of the latter Common Prayer Book. Alſo the Biſhops have Expunged a Prayer againſt the *Pope of* Rome *and his deteſtable Enormities*, which was in King *Edward*'s Book; and that *Expreſs Declaration againſt the Corporeal Preſence* is in the Liturgy Publiſhed *Anno* 1559. left out, in Compliance with the Papiſts.

This was the very Reaſon why the Clergy-men were ſo inflexible in their adherence to the Liturgy, and the Worſhip preſcribed thereby; it was becauſe they reſolved to go no farther from *Rome* than needs they muſt, and from a vain Perſwaſion that they ſhould thereby gain Papiſts over to their Communion.

But *the Learned Primate of Ireland* does obſerve, and ingeniouſly acknowledge, that Experience has manifeſted that the Papiſts are not won, but rather hardned in their Superſtitions, by ſuch Methods.

It

It may be time will discover, that some who pretend Zeal for the Common-Prayer Book, are carrying on a design for *Rome:* The Liturgy came from thence, and will perhaps lead thither again.

The Riddle of the Snow and the Water may be applyed here,

Mater me genuit, Mater quoque gignitur ex me.

Not but that some who Comply with the Service-Book are true Protestants, and would suffer with their Non-conformable Brethren (who cannot go so far as they) rather than Embrace Popery.

Nevertheless, the Liturgy has in it self a tendency that way, and will by such as are not hearty Protestants be Improved accordingly.

I Proceed now to the Second Enquiry,

VIZ.

What Reaſon have you to Scruple the Lawfulneſs of laying the Hand on the BIBLE, *and Kiſſing the Book in Swearing?*

I Anſwer briefly.

1. *We do not find in the Scripture that the Lord's Servants were wont to Swear after that Manner.*

There we read of Lifting up the Hand in Swearing, which is like lifting up the Hands or Eyes in Prayer, a natural ſign of Worſhip. To *lift up the Hand to Heaven is a proverbial Expreſſion of a ſolemn Oath*, Gen. 14. 22. Ezek. 20. 23. Rev. 10. 5. In many Nations they uſed this geſture. The Judges in *France* ſay to Him that is to Swear, *Liſt up your Hand*, except

except it be an Eccleſiaſtick Perſon, and they bid him put his hand to his Breaſt. The *Romans* of old, ſo the *Italians* and *Spaniards*, have uſed to lift up the Finger when they Swear ſolemnly.

I cannot juſtifie the practice of the *Germans*, who in taking an Oath, *lift up three Fingers*, as thereby intimating, that they invoke the Sacred Trinity.

2. *Laying the hand on the Book is a ſymbolizing with Popiſh Idolaters, and Superſtitious Jews.*

This Ceremony is immediately derived from the Papiſts, who are wont as they lay the hand on the Book in Swearing, to ſay, *So help me God and theſe holy Evangeliſts*, which is groſs Idolatry; and it is not much better when it is ſaid, *So help you the Contents of this Book.* The judicious *Rivet*, in *Pſal.* 24. p. 308, 309. wiſheth that cuſtom of *touching the Book*, were not at all uſed: He ſaith, The abuſe of it by Idolaters, makes it to be a Ceremony not fit to be retained as an indifferent thing: See him alſo in *Gen.* 24. *Exercit.* 110. *p.* 541.

Some have obſerved, that the *Jews* when an Oath was to be Adminiſtred, did pro-

duce

duce either the Book of the *Law*, or of the *Pſalms*, or ſome other ſacred thing.

And that Superſtition of theirs has given occaſion to the Papiſts to bring either the Holy Evangeliſts, or elſe ſome *Sacred Relique*, and ſet it before him that is to ſwear, thereby to ſtir up his dull mind to the more Reverence and Religion.

Pareus ſaith expreſly, That it is *Popiſh Superſtition, for men in taking an Oath to touch the Goſpel with their fingers.* Comment. in *Gen.* 24. 2.

3. *Kiſſing in a Religious way is a geſture of Adoration.*

When 'tis ſaid, *Pſalm* 2. 12. *Kiſs the Son*, the meaning is, *Worſhip Him*: *Job* ſaith, he did not when he beheld the Sun and the Moon *Kiſs* his hand, *Chap.* 31. *Verſe* 26, 27. becauſe Idolaters not being able to reach the Sun, in token of Adoration were wont to Kiſs their hands, as many Learned men have out of *Tertullian*, *Pliny* and others truly noted. The Worſhippers of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel* kiſſed them, 1 *Kings* 19. 18. *Hoſ.* 12. 2. And ſo did the Heathen Idolaters, *kiſs their Images*, a ſign of Worſhip. *Minutus*

Fœlix

Felix Reports, That *Cæcilius* kiſſed the Image of *Serapis*, thereby teſtifying his Veneration and Adoration of that falſe God: *Cicero* tells us, that the worſhippers of *Hercules*, had by their frequent *kiſſing* of his Statue, cauſed it to be much worn.

And from the Heathen have the Papiſts learned to *Kiſs their Images*, yea and to *Kiſs the Book too*. For the Prieſt in Celebrating the Maſs, is not onely to Kiſs the Altar nine times, but he muſt alſo take the *Book of the Goſpel and Kiſs it*. This is Clearly to worſhip a Book; and ſo to give unto a Creature that Honour which is due to God alone.

The moſt Learned *Voetius*, in his Diſputation, *de Superſtitione*, p. 156. writeth againſt this practice: And whereas ſome have objected, that Dr. *Ames* in his Caſes, and in his freſh Suit againſt Ceremonies, has pleaded for this Ceremony; *Voetius* ſaith, that what *Ames* ſpeaks, is rather an Excuſe than an Approbation of that Practice.

Mr. *Burroughs* on *Hoſea* 13. 2. obſerves, that it is falſe Worſhip, to give Religious Reſpect to any Creature, whatever the Creature be, by kiſſing as well as by bowing to it: And (ſaith he,) *I know no reaſon*

reaſon why a Book may not be ſet up to bow to, as well as to be kiſſed in taking an Oath.

That Searching and Acute Divine, Dr. *Thomas Goodwin*, has ſometimes profeſſed, that of all the Ceremonies, he looked upon that of Kiſſing the Book in Swearing to be the moſt Idolatrous and Abominable, and that he often wondred that it had been no more witneſſed againſt.

And now Sir, you have my Thoughts concerning both your Queſtions; and you ſee the grounds I go upon: If you judge that any of your Friends will receive Light and Confirmation in the Truth thereby; you may privately Communicate what I have written to you, only let my Name (which can add no Authority to the Truth) be concealed: So I commend you to the Grace of Chriſt, praying that his Holy Spirit may lead us into all Truth.

FINIS.